arXiv:1204.3763v1 [math.LO] 17 Apr 2012

Compactness and separation for represented spaces

Arno Pauly
Clare College
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
`Arno.Pauly@cl.cam.ac.uk`

The effective notions of compactness and topological separation are studied in full generality for represented spaces. Each concept is characterized by a multitude of equivalent properties, each corresponding the computability or continuity of certain functions. In particular, admissibility is identified as the effective counterpart to T_0 separation. A synthetic approach allows simple proofs of strong results compared to the previous literature.

1 Introduction

It is well-known that many representations in computable analysis can be characterized by extremal properties – the prototypic example being that the standard representation of the space of continuous functions carries exactly as much information as needed to make function evaluation computable. In fact, this condition not only characterizes the representation, but also the set itself: Whenever a function is contained in a function space admitting computable function evaluation, it is computable w.r.t. some oracle – it's name – hence, it is continuous. Consequently, rather than speaking merely about representations (of fixed sets) being characterized such, we should consider *represented spaces* – the combination of a set and a representation of it – as the fundamental objects of the characterization results.

In many characterization results in the literature the representation is defined explicitly first, then the extremal property is proven. However, as a consequence of the UTM theorem, this is unnecessary: The condition itself defines the represented space up to computable isomorphisms. In fact, specifying details of standard representations beyond their characterizing property often complicates proofs of basic results, and can obfuscate the algorithmic ideas.

Developing the basic theory of represented spaces based on extremal characterizations amounts to an instantiation of ESCARDÓ's *synthetic topology* [5] with the category of represented spaces. As this category is particularly well-behaved, we obtain a very concise picture, and can prove a few more results on compactness and separation than available in the generic setting.

A synthetic treatment of various subcategories of the category of represented spaces, such as those spaces admissible w.r.t. a topology or a convergence relation, has been done by SCHRÖDER in [9]. These restrictions are either essentially unnecessary, or arise naturally as a consequence of the treatment.

Effective compactness has been studied in [4] by BRATTKA and WEIHRAUCH, and in [3] by BRATTKA and PRESSER. [13] by GRUBBA and WEIHRAUCH basically constitutes a synthetic treatment of closed, open and compact sets for the restricted case of countably based spaces. Effective topological separation was considered in [12] by WEIHRAUCH.

This paper is closely based on [7, Chapter 3], the PhD thesis of the author.

To appear in EPTCS.

2 The foundations

The central notion is the *represented space*, which is a pair $\mathbf{X} = (X, \delta_X)$ of a set X and a partial surjection $\delta_X :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to X$. A multi-valued function between represented spaces is a multi-valued function between the underlying sets. For $f :\subseteq \mathbf{X} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{Y}$ and $F :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we call F a realizer of f (notation $F \vdash f$), iff $\delta_Y(F(p)) \in f(\delta_X(p))$ for all $p \in \operatorname{dom}(f\delta_X)$. A map between represented spaces is called computable (continuous), iff it has a computable (continuous) realizer.

Warning: A priori, the notion of a continuous map between represented spaces and a continuous map between topological spaces are distinct and should not be confused!

We consider two categories of represented spaces, one equipped with the computable maps, and one equipped with the continuous maps. We call the resulting structure a *category extension* (cf. P. [6]), as the former is a subcategory of the latter, and shares its structure (products, coproducts, exponentials) as we shall see next.

Proposition 1. For any two represented spaces $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ there are represented spaces $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$, $\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}$ and computable functions $\pi_1 : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} \to \mathbf{X}$, $\pi_2 : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y} \to \mathbf{X}$, $\iota_1 : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}$, $\iota_2 : \mathbf{Y} \to \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}$, such that:

1. For any pair of continuous maps $f_1 : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{X}$, $f_2 : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{Y}$ there is a unique continuous map $(f_1 \times f_2) : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ with $f_i = \pi_i \circ (f_1 \times f_2)$.
2. If f_1 and f_2 are computable, so is $f_1 \times f_2$.
3. For any pair of continuous maps $f_1 : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{Z}$, $f_2 : \mathbf{Y} \to \mathbf{Z}$ there is a unique continuous map $(f_1 + f_2) : \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y} \to \mathbf{Z}$ with $f_i = (f_1 + f_2) \circ \iota_i$.
4. If f_1 and f_2 are computable, so is $f_1 + f_2$.

Given two represented spaces $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ we obtain a third represented space $\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ of functions from X to Y by letting 0^n1p be a $[\delta_X \to \delta_Y]$-name for f, if the n-th Turing machine equipped with the oracle p computes a realizer for f. As a consequence of the UTM theorem, $\mathscr{C}(-,-)$ is the exponential in the category of continuous maps between represented spaces, and the evaluation map is even computable.

Proposition 2. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X, \delta_X)$, $\mathbf{Y} = (Y, \delta_Y)$, $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, \delta_Z)$, $\mathbf{U} = (U, \delta_U)$ be represented spaces. Then the following functions are computable:

1. $\operatorname{eval} : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \times \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{Y}$ defined via $\operatorname{eval}(f, x) = f(x)$.
2. $\operatorname{curry} : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}))$ defined via $\operatorname{curry}(f) = x \mapsto (y \mapsto f(x,y))$.
3. $\operatorname{uncurry} : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})) \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$ defined via $\operatorname{uncurry}(f) = (x,y) \mapsto f(x)(y)$.
4. $\circ : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \times \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$, the composition of functions
5. $\times : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \times \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{Z}) \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{Y} \times \mathbf{Z})$
6. $\operatorname{const} : \mathbf{Y} \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ defined via $\operatorname{const}(y) = (x \mapsto y)$.

Proof. All items follow from standard arguments on Turing machines; one merely has to verify that the Type-2 semantics are unproblematic.

1. By definition of $[\delta_X \to \delta_Y]$, if we apply the Turing machine with oracle specified in the $[\delta_X \to \delta_Y]$-name of f to a δ_X-name of x, we obtain a δ_Y-name of $f(x)$.

2. From a Turing machine M we can compute a Turing machine M', such that M' on input p and oracle $\langle q, o\rangle$ simulates M on input $\langle p, q\rangle$ and oracle o.
3. and vice versa.
4. Composition of Turing machines is computable, and appropriate access to the two oracles can be ensured. As composition of realizers yields a realizer of the composition, this suffices.
5. The execution of two Turing machines in parallel can be simulated by a single one, access to the oracles can be done accordingly. Products of realizers are realizers of products.
6. This is done via a Turing machine which ignores its input and copies the oracle tape to the output tape.

□

Corollary 3. Let $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$, $\mathbf{Z}$ be represented spaces. For any $x \in X$, the map $\text{partial}_x : \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$ defined via $\text{partial}_x(f) = (y \mapsto f(x, y))$ is continuous. If x is computable, then so is partial_x.

In the following, we will want to make use of two special represented spaces, $\mathbb{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \delta_{\mathbb{N}})$ and $\mathbb{S} = (\{0,1\}, \delta_{\mathbb{S}})$. The representation are given by $\delta_{\mathbb{N}}(0^n 1 0^{\mathbb{N}}) = n$, $\delta_{\mathbb{S}}(0^{\mathbb{N}}) = 0$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{S}}(p) = 1$ for $p \neq 0^{\mathbb{N}}$. It is straight-forward to verify that the computability notion for the represented space $\mathbb{N}$ coincides with classical computability over the natural numbers.

The Sierpiński space $\mathbb{S}$ in turn allows us to formalize semi-decidability. The computable functions $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{S}$ are exactly those where $f^{-1}(\{1\})$ is recursively enumerable (and thus $f^{-1}(\{0\})$ co-recursively enumerable). In general, for any represented space $\mathbf{X}$ we obtain two spaces of subsets of $\mathbf{X}$; the space of open sets $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ by identifying $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ with $f^{-1}(\{1\})$, and the space of closed sets $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ by identifying $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ with $f^{-1}(\{0\})$.

Proposition 4. Let $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ be represented spaces. Then the following functions are well-defined and computable:

1. ${}^C : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$, ${}^C : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ mapping a set to its complement
2. $\cup : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$, $\cup : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$
3. $\cap : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$, $\cap : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$
4. $\bigcup : \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ mapping a sequence $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of open sets to their union $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n$
5. $\bigcap : \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ mapping a sequence $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of closed sets to their intersection $\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} A_n$
6. ${}^{-1} : \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y}), \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y}))$ mapping f to f^{-1} as a set-valued function for open sets
7. $\in : \mathbf{X} \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\in(x, U) = 1$, if $x \in U$.
8. $\times : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y})$

Proof. 1. By definition both functions are realized by $\text{id}_{\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}}$.

2. Note that the functions $\wedge, \vee : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S} \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\wedge(1,1) = 1$, $\wedge(x,y) = 0$ otherwise, $\vee(0,0) = 0$, $\vee(x,y) = 1$ are computable. A machine realizing them simply writes 0s until it reads a non-zero value from one or both input components, then it continues with 1s. Now taking into consideration that $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$, $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$ may be considered as subspaces of the function space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbb{S})$, we may realize $\cup : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ by composition (Proposition 2 (4, 6), together with the diagonal) of $\wedge$ and $\times$ from Proposition 2 (5), likewise the composition of $\vee$ and $\times$ realizes $\cup : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X})$.

3. This follows from 1. and 2. using de Morgan's law.
4. The function $\exists : \mathscr{C}(\mathbb{N},\mathbb{S}) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\exists((x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) = 1$, if $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $x_n = 1$, and $\exists((x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) = 0$ otherwise is computable. Composition of $\exists$ with the input yields the output, and is computable due to Proposition 2 (4).
5. This follows from 1. and 4. using de Morgan's law.
6. Again, this is a special case of composition, which is computable due to Proposition 2 (4).
7. Here we have a special case of eval, which is computable due to Proposition 2 (1).
8. This follows from composing the computable function $\times : \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbb{S}) \times \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{Y},\mathbb{S}) \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X}\times\mathbf{Y},\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{S})$ from Proposition 2 (6) together with $\vee : \mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{S} \to \mathbb{S}$.

$\square$

A represented space $\mathbf{X}$ canonically induces a topological space by equipping the set X by the quotient topology $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ of $\delta_X :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to X$. One can verify that $\mathscr{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the underlying set of $\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})$. The open sets of a represented space are the open sets in the induced topological space. Proposition 4 (6) implies that a continuous map between represented spaces is also continuous as a map between the induced topological spaces. However, the converse is generally false.

3 Compactness

Definition 5. A represented space $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) compact, if the map $\mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}} : \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}(\emptyset) = 1$ and $\mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}(A) = 0$ otherwise is continuous (computable).

Proposition 6. The following properties are equivalent for a represented space $\mathbf{X}$:

1. $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) compact.
2. $\mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{X}} : \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{X}}(X) = 1$ and $\mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{X}}(U) = 0$ otherwise is continuous (computable).
3. For every (computable) $A \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ the subspace $\mathbf{A}$ is (computably) compact.
4. $\subseteq: \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\subseteq(A,O) = 1$, iff $A \subseteq O$ is continuous (computable).
5. $\mathrm{IsCover} : \mathscr{C}(\mathbb{N},\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\mathrm{IsCover}((U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) = 1$, iff $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n = X$ is continuous (computable).
6. $\mathrm{FiniteSubcover} :\subseteq \mathscr{C}(\mathbb{N},\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$ with $\mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{FiniteSubcover}) = \{(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mid \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n = X\}$ and $N \in \mathrm{FiniteSubcover}((U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$ iff $\bigcup_{n=0}^{N} U_n = X$ is continuous (computable).
7. $\mathrm{Enough} :\subseteq \mathscr{C}(\mathbb{N},\mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{N}$ with $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Enough})$ iff $\bigcap_{i\in\mathbb{N}} A_i = \emptyset$, and $N \in \mathrm{Enough}((A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}})$ iff $\bigcap_{i\leq N} A_i = \emptyset$ is continuous (computable).
8. For all $\mathbf{Y}$, the map $\pi_2 : \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X}\times\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{Y})$ defined via $\pi_2(A) = \{y \in \mathbf{Y} \mid \exists x \in \mathbf{X}\ (x,y) \in A\}$ is continuous (computable).
9. For some non-empty $\mathbf{Y}$ (containing a computable point), the map $\pi_2 : \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X}\times\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{Y})$ is continuous (computable).

Proof. 1. $\Leftrightarrow$ 2. $\mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{X}}$ have exactly the same realizers.

1. $\Leftrightarrow$ 3. X is always a computable element of $\mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$, as it is realized by the constant function $p \mapsto 0^{\mathbb{N}}$. This provides the implication 1. $\Leftarrow$ 3.. For the other direction, note $\text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{A}}(B) = \text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}(A \cap B)$, so continuity (computability) of $\text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{A}}$ follows from Proposition 4 (2) together with Corollary 3 and Proposition 2 (2).

1. $\Leftrightarrow$ 4. $\emptyset \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})$ is computable by Proposition 2 (6), so if $\subseteq$ is computable, so is $A \mapsto \subseteq (A, \emptyset)$ by Corollary 3. For the other direction, observe $A \subseteq B \Leftrightarrow A \cap B^C = \emptyset$, so we may use the combination of Proposition 4 (1, 3), Corollary 3 and Proposition 2 (2) to obtain computability of $\subseteq$ here.

2. $\Leftrightarrow$ 5. By Proposition 2 (6) we can compute $(U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from U, and clearly $\text{IsFull}(U) = \text{IsCover}((U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$. On the other hand, by Proposition 4 (4), we can compute $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n$ from $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and $\text{IsCover}((U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) = \text{IsFull}(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n)$.

5. $\Rightarrow$ 6. Assume that the Turing machine M computes IsCover (potentially with access to some oracle). In order to solve FiniteSubcover, we simulate M on the input for FiniteSubcover (which is of a suitable type). As we know that the input sequence *does* cover X, we also know that M has to write a 1 eventually. When M writes the first 1, it has only read some finite prefix of the input. In particular, we may assume that M has no information at all about the U_n with $n > N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we can find such an N effectively from observing the simulation of M.

Now N constitutes a valid answer to $\text{FiniteSubcover}((U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$. To see this, assume the contrary. Then $\bigcup_{n=0}^{N} U_n \neq X$. Now consider the sequence $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $U'_n = U_n$ for $n \leq N$ and $U'_n = \emptyset$ otherwise. On some name for $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, M will eventually print a 1 - as it cannot distinguish $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ before that. But as $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ does not constitute a cover of X, this contradicts the initial assumption.

6. $\Rightarrow$ 2. Assume that the Turing machine M computes FiniteSubcover (potentially with access to some oracle). In order to solve $\text{IsFull}(U)$, we simulate M on input $(U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, which we can obtain by Proposition 2 (6). Beside the simulation, we repeatedly write 0s on the output tape. If M ever produces some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as output, we write a 1. This actually solves $\text{IsFull}(U)$ correctly.

If $U = X$, then $(U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a valid input for FiniteCover, so eventually some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ will be produced, causing the final result to be $1 \in \mathbb{S}$. Now assume that M produces some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ on input $(U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for $U \neq X$. At the time where N has been written, M has only received information about some finite prefix of its input. In particular, there is some $K > N$ s.t. M exhibits the same behaviour when faced with the input sequence $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $U'_n = U$ for $n \leq K$ and $U'_n = X$ otherwise. As $(U'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a valid input for FiniteSubcover, M would be required to produce some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq K$ rather than N. The contradiction can only be resolved by the assumption that M never completes an output on input $(U)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for $U \neq X$, which yields the final answer to be $0 \in \mathbb{S}$.

6. $\Leftrightarrow$ 7. This follows via Proposition 4 (1).

1. $\Rightarrow$ 8. By Proposition 2 (2), we can compute $y \mapsto (x \mapsto A(x,y))$ from $A \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y})$. Now we find $(x \mapsto A(x,y)) \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$, and if $\text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is computable, so is $y \mapsto \text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}(x \mapsto A(x,y)) = \pi_2(A)$.

8. $\Rightarrow$ 9. Just instantiate with $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbb{N}$.

9. $\Rightarrow$ 1. Let $y \in \mathbf{Y}$ be a (computable) point. Then $A \mapsto (y \in \pi_2(A \times Y)^C)$ realizes $\text{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}}$, and is continuous (computable) using the assumption, together with Proposition 4 (1, 6, 7) together with Corollary 3.

□

Proposition 7. Let $\mathbf{X}$ be (computably) compact and $f : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{Y}$ a (computable) continuous surjection. Then $\mathbf{Y}$ is (computably) compact.

Proof. We use the characterization of compactness provided by Proposition 6 (2). By Proposition 4 (6) we find $f^{-1} : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ to be continuous (computable). Now observe $\mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{Y}}(U) = \mathrm{IsFull}_{\mathbf{X}}(f^{-1}(U))$ due to surjectivity of f. $\square$

Proposition 8. If $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ are (computably) compact, then so is $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$.

Proof. Note $\mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{X}\times\mathbf{Y}} = \mathrm{IsEmpty}_{\mathbf{Y}} \circ \pi_2$, and use Proposition 6 (8). $\square$

We can call a subset of a represented space compact, if it is compact when represented with the subspace representation. A compact set $K \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ is called *saturated*, iff $K = \bigcap_{\{U \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \mid K \subseteq U\}} U$. Noting that for compact K the set $\{U \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \mid K \subseteq U\}$ is open in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$, we obtain a representation of the set $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ of saturated compact sets by identifying it as a subspace of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}))$. In particular, this makes $\subseteq : \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathbb{S}$ computable, and provides a uniform counterpart to the results in 6. Often all compact sets are saturated, and we will only make the distinction where relevant.

The union in $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ corresponds to the intersection in $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}))$, hence is well-defined and computable. The intersection of saturated compact sets is problematic (leading to another property of spaces, see Proposition 15), however, we find that the intersection of a compact and a closed set is compact:

Proposition 9. $\cap : \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ is computable.

Proof. The core observation is that $A \cap B \subseteq U$ iff $A \subseteq (U \cup B^C)$ together with Proposition 4 (1, 2). $\square$

Corollary 10. $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) compact, iff $\mathrm{id} : \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ is well-defined and continuous (computable).

There is a fundamental way to obtain compact sets: For $x \in \mathbf{X}$, let $K_x = \bigcap_{\{U \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \mid x \in U\}} U$ be the *saturation* of x. Note that for any open $U \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})$ we find $x \in U$ iff $K_x \subseteq U$, which establishes the:

Observation 11. For any represented space the map $\kappa : \mathbf{X} \to \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ with $\kappa(x) = K_x$ is computable.

The subspace $\{K_x \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\}$ shall be denoted by $\mathbf{X}_\kappa$. The map $\kappa : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}_\kappa$ is reminiscent of the Kolmogorov-quotient (or T_0-reflector) in topology, and observation which will be expanded upon later.

As a conclusion of this section, we present a uniform version of Proposition 7:

Proposition 12. The map $f^{-1} \mapsto f :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y}), \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}), \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{Y}))$ is well-defined and computable.

Proof. It suffices to show that $f^{-1} \mapsto f$ is well-defined, its computability then follows from the computability of $f^{-1} \mapsto (f^{-1})^{-1} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y}), \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X})), \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y})))$ as it is a restriction of this map. The computability of the latter map in turn is a special case of Proposition 4 (6). Well-definedness in turn follows directly from the characterization of $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ as subspace of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}))$. $\square$

Corollary 13. The map $f \mapsto f : \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}), \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{Y}))$ is well-defined and computable.

4 T_2 separation

Definition 14. A represented space $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) T_2, if the map $x \mapsto \{x\} : \mathbf{X} \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ is well-defined and continuous (computable).

Proposition 15. The following properties are equivalent for a represented space $\mathbf{X}$:

1. $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) T_2.
2. $\mathrm{id} : \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ is well-defined and computable.
3. $\cap : \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X})$ is well-defined and computable.
4. $\kappa : \mathbf{X} \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ is well-defined and computable.
5. $\neq: \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \to \mathbb{S}$ defined via $\neq (x,x) = 0$ and $\neq (x,y) = 1$ otherwise is continuous (computable).
6. $\Delta_{\mathbf{X}} = \{(x,x) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}\} \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X})$

Proof. 1. $\Rightarrow$ 2. The map is identical to $K \mapsto (x \mapsto \text{IsEmpty}(K \cap \{x\}))$, which is computable by Propositions 9, 2 using the assumption that $x \mapsto \{x\} : \mathbf{X} \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ is computable.

2. $\Rightarrow$ 3. The claim in 3. is a direct consequence of 2. and Proposition 9.

3. $\Rightarrow$ 2. Observe that $x \in K$ holds for a compact set K, if and only if $K_x \subseteq K$ holds. Hence $\mathrm{id} : \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ is given by $K \mapsto (x \mapsto \text{IsEmpty}(K \cap \kappa(x)))$, if intersection of compact sets is computable.

2. $\Rightarrow$ 4. 4. follows immediately from 2. and Observation 11.

4. $\Rightarrow$ 2. Similar to 3. $\Rightarrow$ 2.: In $K \mapsto (x \mapsto \text{IsEmpty}(K \cap \kappa(x)))$ use $\kappa : \mathbf{X} \to \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$, and the intersection from Proposition 9.

2. $\Rightarrow$ 5. Given $x, y \in \mathbf{X}$, compute $K_x, K_y \in \mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X})$ by Observation 11, and then $K_x, K_y \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$ by the assumption. Now the claim follows from $x \neq y$ iff $x \notin K_y \vee y \notin K_x$.

5. $\Rightarrow$ 1. By Proposition 2 (2) we find $x \mapsto (y \mapsto \neq (x,y))$ to be continuous (computable), but this has the same realizers as $x \mapsto \{x\}$.

5. $\Leftrightarrow$ 6. This is just a reformulation along the definition of $\mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X})$.

□

At the first glance, Definition 14 seems to be a prime candidate for T_1 separation rather than T_2 separation. In light of Proposition 15, it is clear that the denotation T_2 is justified, too. The reason to prefer the identification as T_2 rather than T_1 separation lies in the observation that a represented space is T_2, if and only if the induced topological space is sequentially T_2. On the other hand, there are represented spaces not satisfying Definition 14 but induce a T_1 topology.

5 Admissibility as effective T_0 separation

SCHRÖDER [11] defines a represented space $\mathbf{X}$ to be *admissible*, if any function $f : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to (X, \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X}))$ that is continuous as a map between topological spaces is already continuous as a map between represented spaces. The special rôle of Cantor space in the definition is non-essential:

Theorem 16 (SCHRÖDER [11, Theorem 4])**.** Let δ_X, δ_Y be admissible, and $f : (X, \mathscr{T}_{(X,\delta_X)}) \to (Y, \mathscr{T}_{(Y,\delta_Y)})$ be continuous. Then $f : (X, \delta_X) \to (Y, \delta_Y)$ is continuous.

Here we claim that admissibility can be seen as an effective counterpart to T_0 separation. We begin with demonstrating that the induced topology of any admissible represented space is T_0:

Proposition 17. The indiscrete topology on $\{0,1\}$ is not the final topology of any admissible representation.

Proof. As every function $f : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}$ is continuous w.r.t. to the indiscrete topology, there are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ continuous functions in the topological sense. However, the cardinality of $\mathscr{C}(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbf{X})$ cannot exceed that of the continuum. □

Corollary 18. Every admissibly represented space is T_0.

The admissible spaces have a nice closure property w.r.t. the exponential:

Theorem 19 ([1]). Let $\mathbf{Y}$ be admissibly represented. Then $\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})$ is admissibly represented.

Proof. Let $f :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathscr{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})$ be continuous as a function between topological spaces. Consider the function $g :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to Y$ defined via $g(\langle p,q\rangle) = (f(p))(\delta_X(q))$. As a function between topological spaces, g is continuous. This can be seen from $g = \mathrm{eval} \circ (f \times \delta_X) \circ \langle\ \rangle^{-1}$. By Proposition 2 (1) eval is even continuous as a function between represented spaces, so by Proposition **??** it is continuous regarding the topologies, too. δ_X is trivially continuous w.r.t its own quotient topology, f is continuous by assumption, and finally $\langle\ \rangle^{-1}$ is continuous.

As δ_Y is assumed to be admissible, g has a continuous realizer $G :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. By Proposition 2 (2), also $F :\subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined via $F(p) = [\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}]^{-1}(q \mapsto G(\langle p,q\rangle))$ is continuous. Now F is the sought realizer of f. □

Observation 20. $\mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ are admissibly represented.

Corollary 21. For any represented space $\mathbf{X}$, the spaces $\mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})$, $\mathscr{A}(\mathbf{X})$, and $\mathscr{K}(\mathbf{X})$ are admissibly represented.

The following characterization of admissibility demonstrates that the properties of a specific map are sufficient to define it:

Proposition 22. $\mathbf{X}$ is admissibly represented iff $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}_\kappa$ are continuously isomorphic, i.e. iff $\kappa^{-1} : \mathbf{X}_\kappa \to \mathbf{X}$ is well-defined and continuous.

Proof. Corollary 21 together with the observation that admissibility is preserved under formation of subspaces establishes $\mathbf{X}_\kappa$ to be an admissibly represented space. By Observation 11 the map $\kappa : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}_\kappa$ is computable, so it suffices to show that κ has a continuous inverse if $\mathbf{X}$ is admissible.

First, we point out that κ is injective iff $(X, \mathscr{T}_{\mathbf{X}})$ is T_0. By Corollary 18, any topology induced by an admissible representation is T_0. Due to Theorem 16 then we see that κ has an inverse continuous as a map between represented spaces, iff $\kappa(U) \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$ for any $U \in \mathscr{O}(\mathbf{X})$.

The latter claim follows from the observation that $K_x \in \kappa(U)$ iff $K_x \subseteq U$ for any $K_x \in \mathbf{X}_\kappa$, and that the ability to semidecide the former makes $\kappa(U)$ open, whereas the latter is semidecidable by virtue of K_x being a compact and U an open subset of $\mathbf{X}$. □

---

[1] This theorem generalizes a result from [11] (as we do not need admissibility of δ_X), the proof closely resembles the proof of [10, Proposition 4.2(2)], both by SCHRÖDER.

In the light of Proposition 22, it makes sense to call a represented space $\mathbf{X}$ *computably admissible*, iff $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}_\kappa$ are even computably isomorphic. Note that such an isomorphism means that any point is effectively determined by the totality of its neighborhoods, just as T_0 separation means that a point is determined by the totality of its neighborhoods.

Returning to the remark that κ behaves similar to the Kolmogorov quotient, we will show that κ is the admissible reflector (and even effectively so!), which amounts to the following:

Theorem 23. Let $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$ be represented spaces, and let $\mathbf{Y}$ be (computably) admissible. There is a (computable) continuous map $\mathfrak{R} : \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa,\mathbf{Y})$ such that $f = \mathfrak{R}(f) \circ \kappa$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})$.

Proof. Taking into consideration $\mathbf{X}_\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ and $f(K_x) = K_{f(x)}$ for continuous maps, we can use Corollary 13 to compute $f \mapsto f : \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y}) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa,\mathbf{Y}_\kappa)$. Then we use Proposition 2 (4, 6) to compose f with κ^{-1} obtained from Proposition 22. □

Corollary 24. $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \cong \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$, $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cong \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}) \cong \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$, $\mathbf{X}_\kappa \cong (\mathbf{X}_\kappa)_\kappa$

The ideas used to prove Theorem 23 can do more. For admissible codomains, continuity defined via realizer coincides with preimages of opens being effectively open and coincides with images of compacts be effectively compact. This provides counterparts to Corollary 13 and Proposition 4 (6). In fact, these properties can be used to characterize admissibility:

Theorem 25. The following properties are equivalent for a represented space $\mathbf{X}$:

1. $\mathbf{X}$ is (computably) admissible.
2. $\kappa^{-1} : \mathbf{X}_\kappa \to \mathbf{X}$ is well-defined and continuous (computable).
3. $\mathbf{X}$ is T_0, and for any represented space $\mathbf{Y}$ the map $f \mapsto f :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{Y}),\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{X})$ is continuous (computable).
4. $\mathbf{X}$ is T_0, and for any represented space $\mathbf{Y}$ the map ${}^{-1} :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}),\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Y})) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{X})$ is continuous (computable).

Proof. 1. ⇔ 2. In the continuous category, this is the statement of Proposition 22, in the computable category this is the definition.

2. ⇒ 3. This is a consequence of Theorem 23.

3. ⇒ 4. Via Proposition 12.

4. ⇒ 2. Instantiate with $\mathbf{Y} := \mathbf{X}_\kappa$. By Corollary 24, we have $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \cong \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$, hence $\kappa^{-1} : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}) \to \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_\kappa)$ is computable. The assumption then implies that $\kappa = (\kappa^{-1})^{-1}$ is continuous (computable). □

6 Concluding remarks

It was demonstrated that compactness (Proposition 6), T_2 separation (Proposition 15) and admissibility (Theorem 25) all encompass various equivalent properties of represented spaces each characterized by the continuity or computability of specific maps. This marks the extent of possible generalizations of many standard results on computability for sets and functions. In particular, unnecessary restrictions in prior work such as admissibility, second-countability or metrizability are avoided.

As the realizers witnessing the computability of the relevant mappings are generic and independent of the represented spaces involved, the approach presented here is a viable alternative to the introduction of multi-representations of countably based admissibly represented spaces suggested in [8] by RETTINGER and WEIHRAUCH.

Moving away from effective topological spaces, i.e. countably based admissible represented spaces, to represented spaces as the primitive objects of investigation for set and function computability opens up options for an integration with the study of hyper-computation. ZIEGLER [14, 15] and BRATTKA [1] (see also [2]) observed that various kinds of hyper-computation such as limit computability or computability with mindchanges can be adequately characterized by means of operators generating new represented spaces from given ones. Based on these, a suitable characterization of functions such as topological closure and interior in terms of computable maps between appropriate represented spaces ought to be possible.

References

[1] Vasco Brattka: *Limit Computable Functions and Subsets*. Unpublished.

[2] Vasco Brattka, Matthew de Brecht & Arno Pauly (2012): *Closed Choice and a Uniform Low Basis Theorem*. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic .

[3] Vasco Brattka & Gero Presser (2003): *Computability on subsets of metric spaces*. Theoretical Computer Science 305(1-3), pp. 43 – 76.

[4] Vasco Brattka & Klaus Weihrauch (1999): *Computability on subsets of Euclidean space I: closed and compact subsets*. Theoretical Computer Science 219(1-2), pp. 65 – 93.

[5] Martin Escardó (2004): *Synthetic topology of datatypes and classical spaces*. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 87.

[6] Arno Pauly (2011). *Many-one reductions between search problems*. arXiv 1102.3151. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.3151`.

[7] Arno Pauly (2012): *Computable Metamathematics and its Application to Game Theory*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.

[8] Robert Rettinger & Klaus Weihrauch. *Products of Effective Topological Spaces and a uniformly computable Tychonoff Theorem*. submitted.

[9] Matthias Schröder (2002): *Admissible Representations for Continuous Computations*. Ph.D. thesis, FernUniversität Hagen.

[10] Matthias Schröder (2002): *Effectivity in Spaces with Admissible Multirepresentations*. Mathematical Logic Quarterly 48(1), pp. 78–90.

[11] Matthias Schröder (2002): *Extended admissibility*. Theoretical Computer Science 284(2), pp. 519–538.

[12] Klaus Weihrauch (2010): *Computable Separation in Topology, from T_0 to T_2*. Journal of Universal Computer Science 16(18), pp. 2733–2753.

[13] Klaus Weihrauch & Tanja Grubba (2009): *Elementary Computable Topology*. Journal of Universal Computer Science 15(6), pp. 1381–1422.

[14] Martin Ziegler (2007): *Real Hypercomputation and Continuity*. Theory of Computing Systems 41, pp. 177 – 206.

[15] Martin Ziegler (2007): *Revising Type-2 Computation and Degrees of Discontinuity*. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 167, pp. 255–274.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Vasco Brattka, Martin Escardó and Matthias Schröder for various discussions crucial for the formation of the present work.